

Appendix

“Issues” Forum Comments
“Choices” Forum Comments
Written Comments

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Issues Forum Comments

No.	Alternative Transportation Modes
1	People would use if it had connections to MARTA. Especially for airport trips.
2	Would be used for work trips.
3	Would not be used for shopping.
4	Cost about \$5.00 for one-way trip.
5	With only AM and PM schedules it may limit additional users. They don't want to feel "stranded" at work if the train only ran at certain times.
6	There are similar patterns of commuters to and from Atlanta or Athens in each peak period, so the trains should run in both directions equally in each peak.
7	Commuter rail schedule is not very time-sensitive for business. (Working late, leaving early, etc.)
8	May not be used as much because of high cost.
9	People would definitely use rail if available, however it would depend on cost.
10	About \$10.00 round-trip, though some think this is too high.
11	Rail would be used much more if SR 316 were not improved. i.e., more delay on 316 would cause more to use rail.
12	The location of the stations should be convenient for commuters. Provide shuttle buses to stations and good accessibility.
13	People would ride if it was fast and convenient.
14	It is a good economic alternative if comparable to cost of trip in gas.
15	Rail is easier than bus because of consistent schedules. It is not affected by traffic congestion.
16	Need more frequent rail service for more use.
17	There is generally more support for rail service as opposed to other modes.
18	People would pay \$2.00 - \$3.50 for one-way service.
19	Rail use would be very dependent on the location of stations and route. Would need to be convenient for riders.
20	Rail would not be used for special events, like football games.
21	Strong support for rail. Most think it would be used more than express bus.
22	Would need to have connections to MARTA.
23	People would pay about \$3.00 one-way or \$100 for a month pass.
24	Rail would save time as opposed to bus or carpool.
25	Rail might encourage or help shape development and growth, which would happen with or without the rail.
26	Would need connection to MARTA.
27	A lot of use for trips to the airport.
28	People would pay \$5-6.00 for round-trip or \$3-\$4 for one-way.
29	Students probably would not use rail.
30	More use compared to bus because of quicker travel time.
31	Support for rail – would be used more than rail. Especially for trips to the airport.
32	Rail use would reduce the need to improve 316 as drastically.
33	More frequent schedules for commuter rail would be better.
34	Rail use allows riders to get work done during commute. Less time is spent transferring and waiting for buses.
35	Rail service should be offered at off-peak times for special events (sports, culture, etc.)
36	People would pay about \$11.00 roundtrip.
37	Rail is desirable because it offers consistent travel time, unaffected by road congestion.
38	Mixed support for rail use.
39	Students may use rail.
40	Presence of rail may raise safety issues. "Bringing the city out to the communities."
41	Commuter rail would be used for business and special events, if it offered frequent schedules.
42	Support for commuter rail because it offers time for commuters to work, read, etc. while riding.

No.	Alternative Transportation Modes
43	Rail would need more frequent schedule and frequent headways to get higher use.
44	Tie into the bus system to allow circulation around destination points.
45	Would pay \$5-\$6 for one-way trip.
46	Employers should offer programs to subsidize rail pass costs.

No.	HOV Lanes
1	Most people see HOV lanes as being desirable all the way to Athens, not right away, but eventually it will be necessary. (Others think it's not needed further than Gwinnett Co. line.)
2	Better enforcement to discourage violators.
3	Have reversible/moveable barriers to accommodate different peak periods.
4	People don't feel express bus would be used on the HOV lanes.
5	HOT lanes are a good option – charging SOV passengers to use the HOV lane.
6	Some would use HOV, others say they would not.
7	Isolate HOV lanes so that accidents on 316 don't stop HOV travel.
8	Make HOV reversible for peak direction.
9	Some people suggested SR 316 being entirely HOV during peak periods (others say this is unfeasible)
10	Establish programs with employers to have staggered work hours and carpool options.
11	HOV not feasible because it is difficult for carpool coordination.
12	Not cost-beneficial.
13	Express bus is a good idea.
14	HOV lanes are too fast and unsafe.
15	Not many carpool options for local Barrow residents.
16	Express bus would get more use on the HOV lanes than carpools.
17	Elevated HOV lanes.
18	Build isolated HOV lanes with barriers.
19	Mixed support for HOV lanes.
20	Some think it would have a negative impact on the environment.
21	Needed all the way to Athens.
22	Express bus would be used only if it was convenient. Provide shuttle circulators/P&R lots.
23	HOV would be useful for family carpools as well as business commuters.
24	Support for HOV all the way to Athens.
25	Express bus is not a good short-term solution, but may be necessary after about 10 years of growth on the corridor.
26	Express bus would get used, but not as much as rail.
27	Provide more HOV exit ramps to cross streets (better access than HOV on I-75/85).
28	Express bus would work well with an extensive HOV system in connection with existing system.
29	HOV should not be extended to Athens.
30	Would not be used much by work commuters.
31	Express bus would be used if it offered connections to a wider area. Provide circulators at destination areas.
32	Students may be likely to carpool, use HOV.
33	Majority think HOV would be used.
34	Higher use if it is enforced well.
35	Barrier walls for HOV are bad for clearing accidents if they happen in HOV lane.
36	Model HOV like Washington, D.C. (Virginia side) with median space to clear accidents.
37	There are limited carpool options for many to use HOV.

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Issues Forum Comments

No.	HOV Lanes (Continued)
38	Increasing gas price may lead to more carpool use.
39	Good integration with existing HOV is essential (I-85 interchange especially).
40	May be a lot of use of express bus between UGA and new campus at Collins Hill.
41	Cirulators at stations are necessary for convenience.
42	General support for HOV lanes along with good enforcement, all the way to Athens.
43	Some say HOV lanes would not influence commuter's decision to carpool (i.e. carpooling is inconvenient)
44	Enforcing a lower speed limit on the SOV lanes may encourage HOV use.
45	Charging SOV commuters to use HOV lanes is a good option.
46	Express bus would be used if it offered good connections to existing transit.

No.	Funding
1	If SR 316 is to become a toll road – need to have an alternative free route.
2	It would be helpful to have a Master Plan to pursue funding sources/mechanisms.
3	Consider Tax Increment Financing (TIF).
4	Tolls generally supported if necessary to move project forward.
5	Some prefer flat toll.
6	Some prefer toll based on length.
7	Need to move forward on this project. May need a special authority created to move forward.
8	If there are a lot of long distance trips, like to see tolls with frontage roads for local access.
9	Would favor whatever funding option works fastest so that right-of-way costs don't keep increasing.
10	User-fee concept makes sense.
11	Who pays for frontage roads.
12	Make sure Planning and Zoning compatible with road design.
13	Oconee County has been acknowledging special access needs along specific sections of SR 316.
14	Need alternative routes for short-distance trips.
15	Question about what funding alternatives will be studied along with toll facility.
16	Is there a way to get SR 316 improvements on the Governor's GRIP program.
17	Does GARVEE program consume 100% of future federal funds.
18	GARVEE bonds can only be used for GRIP projects.
19	Tolls are possible source of funds to accelerate implementation.
20	Would support tolls, if alternatives like commuter rail were funded with tolls too.
21	Would support tolls if tolls are used just for SR 316 improvements and not for alternatives like commuter rail.
22	Supportive of tolls if other road alternatives were provided with toll revenues.
23	Supportive of tolls if tolls were to be removed after bonds for SR 316 were retired.
24	Tolls more favorable than impact fee.
25	General support for HOT concept.
26	Concern about amount of traffic that would divert off of SR 316 to local roads.
27	Previous old cost estimates for improvements on SR 316 were around \$450 million.
28	Construction costs will rise rapidly the longer the project languishes.
29	Where would tolls be collected if toll road (concern about the location of toll booths)?
30	If toll road, where would the toll revenue be spent?
31	Could toll revenues from GA 400 be applied to project costs to improve SR 316.
32	Expectation that State and Federal Gas Tax Funds and taxes would pay for SR 316 improvements.
33	Advantages in developing purpose and need based on operation/safety/HOV type of improvement.
34	Amount of toll would be of concern.
35	Do not support HOT lanes, the whole point of HOV lanes is to get people out of their cars.

No.	Funding (Continued)
36	Consider all different cost components of this project: Overpasses/Underpasses, Frontage Roads, Interchanges.
37	For tolls – need to be freeway-type facility.
38	Concerned about traffic that would be diverted from SR 316 to Atlanta Hwy. if there were tolls.
39	What happens to tolls on GA 400 once bonds are paid off?
40	What would happen on SR 316 after the bonds are paid off?
41	Tolls make sense for long trips but not for short trips.
42	Generally willing to pay \$.50 to use facility.
43	Tolls would leverage funds to improve SR 316 from users outside of Gwinnett, Barrow & Oconee and take the burden off of local residents and businesses.
44	Toll collection could complicate operations and safety on SR 316.
45	Also difficult during UGA football game days.
46	Education, Enforcement, and Engineering to improve operations and safety on SR 316.
47	I will not pay toll. I will use other facilities. So will my friends.
48	Investigate Gwinnett Co.'s Current SPLOST program for potential funds.
49	Important for Community to think that "Everyone" is paying for some part of project.
50	Need more enforcement of speed limit.
51	Would support tolls if it would improve safety on SR 316. The cost would be worth it (his daughter was almost killed on SR 316).
52	Collateral impacts – like traffic diversions to SR8/Atlanta Hwy.
53	Toll Road – Retail establishments would be adversely affected. (Why pay toll to come to Barrow when it's free to travel to the mall in Gwinnett?)
54	Concern tolls and SR 316 improvements are geared for the Athens to Atlanta trip.
55	Tolls are feasible for some for travel but not for others.
56	Concern where toll monies are spent?
57	Concern about the location of toll booths and collection of tolls.
58	Would you have to pay when you get on and off?
59	Will tolls collected in Barrow be spent in Barrow?
60	What happens with toll revenues when bonds are pay off?
61	Can the toll ever be removed?
62	Some questioned whether the toll would ever be removed even when the bonds are paid off?
63	Consider many transportation improvements options along with the toll option: HOV's, buses, HOT Lanes.
64	May support HOT/HOV concept.
65	View toll as just an additional tax.
66	Concerned about complexity and amount of funding.
67	SR 316 Hwy Improvements: Commuter Rail , HOV, etc.
68	Concerns about being tolled for frequent, short trips.
69	Concerns about impact of tolls on business activities where they use SR 316 all day.
70	Concerns about whether toll revenue would ultimately be spent on the toll road or related roads.
71	Concern about truck traffic diverting away from toll collection sites and on to local thoroughfares.
72	As metro Atlanta grows – has anyone considered extension of SR 316 east to Augusta?
73	If HOT lanes- toll would need to be high enough so that the lane would not fill up.
74	Concern that tolls would be collected before grade-separation/expressway was constructed.
75	Question about impact fees – some thought everyone should help pay, both citizens and businesses.
76	Would like to use GARVEE Bonds for SR 316.
77	Don't want tolls. Federal government penalizing commuters for unrestricted development.
78	Could tolls be used to finance highway improvements to avoid Air Quality Sanctions?
79	Would tolls be removed when the construction bonds are paid off?

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Issues Forum Comments

No.	Funding (Continued)
80	Believe that DOT has enough money to do the necessary improvements within their existing budget.
81	HOT lanes are a valid option.
82	Need to know how much money is needed to bolster DOT’s traditional project to construct improvements. Don’t ask question “How much will you pay?”
83	Would paying a toll become a safety issue?
84	Would prefer a flat fare of \$.50 like GA 400.
85	Would like to use GARVEE Bonds for SR 316.
86	Need to talk to make it a re-election issue in Gwinnett County.
87	Toll collection plazas could divert traffic off of SR 316 to secondary roads.
88	Think elected officials could split up project to orchestrate a funding plan that would use Federal Formula and Discretionary Funds.
89	Tolls make sense in that it’s a user fee and is equitable in that sense.
90	Feeling that tolls will discriminate against students.
91	Feeling that tolls will be permanent revenue source that government will use forever.
92	Feel that GDOT and Feds have sufficient funds to construct project in a reasonable time frame.
93	Feel that DOT does not have the funds available.
94	Concerns about being tolled for short, frequent trips on SR 316.
95	I work directly off of SR 316. Unfair to pay toll to go to work.

No.	Highway Improvements
1	Construct grade separated interchanges.
2	Construct interstate entire length with appropriate number of interchanges.
3	Provide more access at Bogart.
4	Use ITS strategies.
5	Use good traffic engineering judgment.
6	Construct full interchange at SR 11.
7	SR 20 is a problem interchange.
8	Improvements should be made one interchange at a time.
9	Construct limited access entire length of 316.
10	Land Use should be High-Tech industries.
11	Land Use should be Mixed-Use development.
12	Should be several centers along corridor (diversified zoning).
13	Avoid haphazard zoning/development.
14	Coordinate with commuter rail projects.
15	SR 20 and Collins Hill need immediate improvements.
16	I-20 and US 78 have been alternative for SR 316.
17	Plan for water, sewage, and infrastructure improvements.
18	Plan for enough residential.
19	Locate residential away from SR 316.
20	Construct interstate with appropriate interchanges and frontage roads.
21	Located residential away from interchanges.
22	Locate high-tech and industrial sites near interchanges.
23	Build landscape buffers (interstate and industrial adjacent).
24	County must coordinate land use.
25	Provide infrastructure for development.
26	Ordinances should protect buffers (coordinate with proposed development).
27	Construct full interchange at Jimmy Daniel Road, Oconee Connector, and Bogart.

No.	Highway Improvements (Continued)
28	Build earth noise buffers.
29	Relocate McNutt and should be a full interchange.
30	Start in Oconee County with grade separated interchanges.
31	Consider crossovers at: Dials Mill Rd.; Mars Hill Rd.; Julian Dr.; and, Virgil Langford Rd.
32	Enforce speed limits (especially with trucks).
33	Access roads should extend from Jimmy Daniel Rd. to Oconee Connector or bridge Virgil Langford Rd. over 316.
34	Don’t close off Virgil Langford Rd.
35	Need lots of overpasses if limited access.
36	Need lower speed limit on 316 (short-term).
37	Need interchanges (limited access).
38	Want high-tech land use along corridor.
39	Need interchange at Bethlehem.
40	Residential Land should not be within a mile of 316.
41	Need limited access highway.
42	Need stricter enforcement by GSP.
43	Speed is too high for current conditions.
44	Consider subdivisions whose current access is directly on 316 (make dangerous U-Turns currently to travel opposite direction from access side).
45	Major trouble seeing traffic signal in sunlight (backplates?).
46	Need flashing beacon to warn when signals are about to turn red.
47	Need more advanced timing on signals (short-term) (ensure no “gap-outs”/time-density).
48	Need signal at Patrick Mill.
49	Want more consistent zones – high tech.
50	Need limited access highway.
51	Interchanges needed at: SR 20; SR 11; SR 81; Old Freemans Mill Rd.; Patrick Mill; and, Harbins Rd.
52	Access needed to Frontage Rd or 316 at (Fire, Safety, Emergency): Patrick Mill; SR 321; SR 81; and, SR11.
53	Towns need access to Frontage Rd or 316(Fire, Safety, Emergency): Monroe; Statham; and Bethlehem.
54	Timing of project is big concern in regards to new and current land use.
55	Utilize county and city improvement (don’t waste money already spent).
56	Pay close attention to land use planning.
57	Plan ahead for HOV construction.
58	Need HOV as part of Project.
59	Extend Turn lanes on SR 11 and SR 81 (Short term solution).
60	Patrick Mill needs short term attention (current conditions dangerous).
61	Need Access/Frontage Roads.
62	Need access to 316 for emergency, safety, mail, school, etc.
63	Need completely limited access with frontage roads.
64	Hills cause bad sight distance at intersections.
65	Need short term solutions @ Patrick Mill and Wall Rd (Extend turn lanes).
66	Speed not the problem – Impatience at intersections is problem.
67	Deceleration/ Acceleration problem.
68	Do not use Yield Signs/ Only stop signs or signals.
69	Sight distance is problem for turners.
70	Signalized intersections are more dangerous than unsignalized.
71	Speed should be 45 mph across corridor
72	Interchange improvements only.

Issues Forum Comments

No.	Highway Improvements (Continued)
73	Interchange at 316 WB and I-85 SB should be converted to right side entry.
74	Widen 316 to 8-lanes.
75	Increase speed limit to 70 mph on 316.
76	Take down signals.
77	Upgrade 316 to interstate.
78	Consider new college at Collins Hill Rd.
79	Consider new developments.
80	Construct 6-lane freeway in Gwinnett Co.
81	Consider interchange improvements at I-85 and 316 based on lanes.
82	Need interchange improvements for short term.
83	C-D or frontage roads around Collins Hill Rd are needed.
84	Construct access roads and frontage roads along 316 (possibly elevated).
85	Revisit clearance intervals along corridor.
86	Extend acceleration/deceleration lanes.
87	No residential zoning adjacent to 316.
88	Don't restrict trucks to one lane.
89	Allow a buffer of industrial, commercial or greenspace along corridor.
90	Interest from Atlanta to Athens.
91	Interchanges should be widely spaced.
92	Construct frontage roads or access roads along corridor.
93	Similar to Peachtree Industrial Blvd.
94	Use "rumble strips" before intersections.
95	Use red light running enforcement.
96	Extend/provide acceleration/deceleration lanes.
97	Round-a-bouts should be used at appropriate locations.

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Choices Forum Comments

No.	HOV Alternates
1	Possible problems with barrier separated HOV lanes: safety, emergency vehicle access, difference in speed.
2	HOV interchanges will be expensive.
3	What if there is an accident in the HOV lanes? Does it block traffic?
4	Don't need barrier separating HOV lanes – too expensive.
5	Do not like to drive between the HOV barriers.
6	Emergency vehicle access in Alt. 1 concern – remove barriers like I85 @ J.C. Blvd.
7	HOT lane support (for long distance SOV trips).
8	Barriers are not good for routing traffic around accidents.
9	Barriers not necessary – enforcement not needed.
10	HOV interchanges not necessary compared to cost of building them.
11	Alternate 2 gives more flexibility to clear traffic.
12	Use HOV for trucks. May be safety issue (blind spots).
13	Can't pass slower traffic in Alternate 1 HOV.
14	Could passing lanes be possible in Alternate 1 HOV?
15	Discourage/enforce HOV trips in the SOV lanes.
16	Consider reversible HOV lanes.
17	HOV interchanges at major intersections.
18	HOV may not be benefit east of Patrick Mill Rd.
19	Enforce HOV lanes.
20	HOV wouldn't be cost effective in Oconee and Barrow.
21	Project and HOV should be phased.
22	HOV interchanges on Alternate 1 should be separate or full interchanges.
23	Alternate 1 good access.
24	Alternate 2 not enough access.
25	Alternate 1 would be unsightly.
26	Alternate 1 safer but more money. Alternate 2 for Barrow. Tolls to get project started.
27	Alternate 2 is better and more convenient.
28	Reversible HOV.
29	No reversible HOV.
30	If HOV – Alternate 1 is safer.
31	HOV not needed now.
32	No barrier – extra shoulder, freedom to exit.
33	In Gwinnett, why build HOV lanes without interchanges – doesn't make sense.
34	HOV lanes will not work. People will not use them.
35	Why do we think that HOV lanes will work on SR 316?
36	Will HOV lanes be fully utilized in the peak hours?
37	Why do we think that HOV lanes will work on SR 316?
38	Will HOV lanes be fully utilized in the peak hours?
39	Consider reversible lanes (some disagree).
40	Consider breaks in barrier in Alternate 1 in order to reduce number of HOV exits required.
41	Dual purpose interchanges needed in Barrow.
42	Alternate 1 is too constricting for traffic flow – emergency vehicle/accident concerns.
43	No Emergency vehicle access in Alternate 1.
44	Alternate 1 stuck behind slower traffic.
45	Alternate 1 stuck behind slower traffic.
46	Do not think that HOV lanes are needed.
47	Barriers may prevent emergency vehicles from having access to accidents.

No.	HOV Alternates (Continued)
48	The new HOV lanes should be constructed to full design standards.
49	Consider reversible HOV lanes instead of permanent HOV lanes.
50	Are HOV lanes needed?
51	Could we do Alternate 1 for some sections and Alternate 2 for others?
52	Are the HOV lane barriers concrete or “moveable”?
53	Cost for HOV worth more than extra general purpose lane.
54	HOV not worth cost.
55	HOV to reduce traffic/pollution.
56	Like Alternate 2 better. Has more flexibility.
57	Left-hand exits onto and off of HOV very unsafe due to high merge speeds into single lane.
58	Missed interchange no options to turn around at next exit.
59	No need for 24-hour HOV lanes should be based on AM/PM peak.
60	Ok with Barrier HOV, but need to have breaks/places where you can cross over.
61	Alternate 2 desirable for ability to get around accidents.
62	Plastic barriers are better to prevent accidents, more flexibility in case want to get off HOV.
63	Need education process with implementation of HOV.
64	Anticipate future traffic.
65	Take into account truck traffic (separation?).
66	Alternate 2 in favor.
67	Phase in Alternate 1 if needed.
68	Build at Alternate 1 width but start at Alternate 2.
69	Build out to 132' for added general purpose.
70	Alternate 1 should be 2 reversible HOV lanes.
71	HOV warranted in Oconee and Barrow?
72	Design for build-out.
73	Phase construction as warranted.
74	Ensure HOV enforcement.
75	Alternate 2 is more desirable. More flexibility in clearing traffic, allows passing by slower traffic, enforcement not needed for SOV.
76	Support HOV/SOV interchanges (dual purpose).
77	Consider Reversible HOV lanes.
78	Consider HOT lanes.
79	Exclusive exits onto barrier HOV would be unsafe because of high merge speeds.
80	No need for 24-hour HOV.
81	Alternate 2 more desirable, increased flexibility for mobility.
82	Education process for new HOV concepts.
83	Alternate 1 width with Alternate 2-lane use with addition of another general-purpose lane.
84	Mix feelings with HOV/toll.
85	I strongly object (disagree) to Alternate 1 with HOV interchange.
86	I strongly favor Alternate 2 with two HOV lanes.
87	Alternate 2 is easier to convert back to general-purpose lanes.
88	Some don't feel safe with barriers on either side of HOV lanes.
89	Are the barriers concrete or rubber poles?
90	I like the idea of limited access but I don't like HOV. I agree something has to be done for safety purposes.
91	Look at access to HOV interchanges by way of the local roads.
92	Tough to get to Virgil Langford HOV interchange.
93	Does not need Mars Hill Road overpass.

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Choices Forum Comments

No.	HOV Alternates (Continued)
94	All interchanges dual-purpose access needed at cross streets.
95	Request for direct access from Virgil Langford in Alt 2.
96	Extend frontage roads to Athens loop.
97	Frontage roads on R/W of SR 316 – not on private property.
98	Alternate 1 is best B/C of frontage roads.
99	Decisions on interchange should be dynamic.
100	Kilcrease (main route from 316 to Auburn) should be full interchange (widening/ext. of 324).
101	Hwy. 29 should be HOV as well.
102	Consider interchange at Boggs Road exit.
103	Kilcrease Road generates more traffic than adjacent interchanges. Put a full interchange at Kilcrease.
104	Barber Creek need full access interchange for SOV.
105	Industrial parks on Kilcrease need full access interchange.
106	Fence Road not HOV.
107	Kilcrease Road – full interchange in Alternate 2. Will relieve traffic on Patrick Mill.
108	Alternate 1 provides better access.
109	Why don’t we just widen SR 316 to a six-lane road, and no HOV lane?
110	If you have the space, why don’t we add more general-purpose lanes, instead of HOV lanes?
111	Don’t need HOV lanes instead have another general-purpose lane.
112	Use 3 general-purpose lanes instead of HOV (build HOV when needed).
113	Alternate 2 with 3 general purpose lanes.
114	Consider more lanes in higher traffic area (Gwinnett).
115	Make SR 316 - 3 lanes (general purpose) in each direction.
116	Leave room on the inside for a possible 4 th lane.
117	Just add another lane.
118	Bus only (no HOV).
119	Additional lanes don’t help traffic. Need alternate routes or alternate transportation modes.

No.	Alternative Funding Strategies
1	How much more money is Alt 1 than 2?
2	Increase spacing between interchanges. This will save money.
3	When will this project start? Completed?
4	Alternate 2 less expensive, flexible in traffic movement.
5	Instead of tolls-raise gas tax.
6	Don’t raise tax.
7	More detailed cost necessary before you make a decision.
8	No tolls.
9	Is Alternate 1 much more expensive than Alternate 2?
10	Toll would be higher if Alternate 1 is built.
11	If a toll is installed, it will stay there “forever”.
12	Is Alternate 1 much more expensive than Alternate 2?
13	Toll would be higher if Alternate 1 is built.
14	If a toll is installed, it will stay there “forever”.
15	We do not want to pay everyday to use SR 316 using a toll.
16	Increase Barrow County sales tax to pay for part of the road.
17	Increase gas tax to help pay for SR 316 improvements.

18	Do not want tolls. Would rather pay a sales tax instead.
19	Would prefer tax to tolls for financing.
20	Expense of Alternate 1 is not justified with safety.
21	Alternate 1 much more expensive.
22	What is the cost of new interchanges?
23	Will tolls speed up the construction of the SR 316 improvements?
24	If we install tolls, when would they be taken away?
25	Can existing sales tax be used for this project?
26	Alternate 2 is less expensive than alternate 1.
27	How much would it cost to convert HOV lanes to general-purpose lanes?
28	No toll.
29	Tolls to fund planning model.
30	Against the tolls. Tolls are never taken away.
31	Take money away from other program/projects and apply it to SR 316.
32	Set a time limit for toll.
33	Reluctant to pay toll on road that has been used previously for free.
34	Mainline toll facility would cause problems.
35	I would support toll roads if a break were made for residents along the corridor. I live off of Harbins Road.
36	Funding should come from Tractor Trailer operator companies as well as from State, Federal, and Bond programs. Creative funding needs to be considered
	No tolls, that costs money too.

No.	Miscellaneous Comments
1	What happens to homes/businesses that are in way of improvements?
2	ROW taking should be avoided.
3	GDOT should consider public comment (specifically property adjacent owners).
4	How do you determine where c/d frontage roads are needed?
5	How do you determine where c/d frontage roads are needed?
6	Development along 316 – proper access?
7	Purchase right-of-way now for future use.
8	Address frontage road now, right-of-way, and cost.
9	Frontage road needed.
10	Buffer between frontage road and developments.
11	Purchase more than enough right-of-way.
12	Purchase right-of-way for full-length frontage road.
13	Right-of-way acquisition should be avoided or limited.
14	Frontage roads critical for access.
15	Consider CD/frontage road. (Right-of-way, development concerns, location).
16	Buy ROW for final build-out, but delay construction.
17	Frontage roads are critical.
18	Look at SR 316/Athens Bypass interchange-has problems now.
19	What will be the sequence of improvements, what interchange will be built first?
20	Short-term improvements have flashing lights, flash <u>only</u> when traffic light is red.
21	Have future improvements be coordinated with recently finished projects (i.e. Oconee Connector Interchange).
22	Use cameras to enforce.
23	Consider avoiding permits for heavy industrial/commercial land uses around interchanges (including buffer).

Choices Forum Comments

No.	Miscellaneous Comments (Continued)
24	“Project will start in Gwinnett County”.
25	Restrict truck traffic to one lane only (Right-turn lane).
26	Barrow County school buses have to cross 316 many times. It is extremely dangerous. Limit trucks speed on 316.
27	Extend red light phase at Patrick Mill signal.
28	Patrick Mill Road needs improvements 1 st .
29	SR 81 also needs immediate improvements.
30	Implement short term improvements – acceleration/deceleration lanes, speed enforcement and lower speed limit. Red light strobes.
31	Patrick Mill – speed enforcement has led to slower traffic.
32	Use electronic surveillance to “police” HOV lanes.
33	Regular policing causes more problems.
34	Does light-rail impact the study?
35	More crossing on I-85 to reduce volume on 316, extend 316 across 85 to Norcross.
36	Need speed enforcement, no need to improve 316.
37	Westbound 316 at Collins Hill road needs right turn lane NOW. Eastbound right turn lengthened.

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Written Comments

- It is important for the economic potential of the 316/US 78 interchange to keep in the plan a frontage road from Julian Drive to US 78 for Deerbrook, Silver Leaf and future development of open road on the N. East corner of 316 and US 78.
- I strongly object (disagree) to Alternate 1 with HOV interchange.
- I strongly favor Alternate 2 with two HOV lanes.
- The only long-term satisfactory solution to the problems along GA 316 is to upgrade the highway to limited access and Interstate status, thereby eliminating crossroads and traffic lights. To fail to do this will create a situation similar to that on US 78 in Southern Gwinnett County at Snellville. As commercial development continues along this corridor, conditions will only grow worse, to the point where finding solutions will be impossible.
- Attached is a recent article from the Athens Banner-Herald concerning highway safety.
- Why did you stop at the Athens by-pass? Won't 316 have a major impact on Clarke County and the University of Georgia as well?
- What about spur roads coming off 316? How will development in the area affect Mars Hill Road and Jimmy Daniels Road areas?
- Are the single lane divided HOV lanes going to work? They seem to really confine the cars and busses in the case of breakdown or accident.
- Do the frontage roads have to be right beside 316 or can they be offset ¼ to ½ mile to accommodate residences, farms, and business?
- Can we force HOV vehicles to use only the HOV lane? That would give 1/3 of the 3 lanes to the 1/3 of the cars you project to be HOV.
- Any chance of making this part of an intrastate highway system?
- A very cheap short-term safety improvement would be to add a right turn lane for westbound traffic at 316 and Collins Hill Road. It is currently difficult to make this turn if the light is green, since traffic behind you does not allow you to slow down.
- I like the idea of the limited access HOV in Alternative 1. I think, though, that you will see a lot of opposition to this from the public, due to a lack of comprehension.
- I would support toll roads if a break were made for residents along the corridor. I live off of Harbins Road.
- I don't think HOV lanes would work on 316 but if implemented, I would prefer a barricade between HOV and SOV lanes.
- Phase 1 should be installation of red light cameras at intersections to ticket speeders.
- Traffic lights at Collins Hill and 20 are both bottlenecks. Collins will get much worse with new WalMart and Perimeter College.
- We need limited on/off ramps where interchanges are close (e.g. Collins Hill to SR 20). In keeping with the above, the use of frontage roads may help make this a reality.
- Are we contemplating a future light commuter rail down the center of HWY 316?
- Will policing of the HOV lanes be done electronically or with cops? Cops with flashing lights screw up traffic worse.
- Are the barriers concrete or rubber poles?
- I like the idea of limited access but I don't like HOV. I agree something has to be done for safety purposes.
- I am for anything for improvement of GA 316 even if it means a toll road. I like HOV lanes. Need some frontage road to get vehicles off freeway. I like Alternate 2 on HOV.
- I am 100% against making 316 a toll road for the following reason. Once a road becomes a toll road in the country they tolls never go away. In the comments of last time, one person stated "could tolls from 400 go and fund 316"? Proof people forget the concept of tolls and once a toll always a toll, therefore, no toll on the road. Find another way take money from other projects and put it to 316 because most traffic use the entire 316 therefore this should be a state issue – full state funding, not toll road.
- Before frontage roads right-of-way is purchased, future development along the frontage roads need to be considered. Specifically, large buffers between the frontage roads and developments should exist so that businesses won't "hug" the frontage roads. In other words, buy plenty of right-of-way now while the land is not as expensive. Because once the land becomes developed, right-of-way will be very expensive to purchase.
- Impacts on converting GA 316 to a toll road should be carefully considered. There should also be good access to alternate roads (e.g. US 29, US 78) from GA 316 for those motorists who do not want to use the GA 316 toll road to navigate from point A to point B. In other words, a very well planned grid system needs to be put in place connecting GA 316 to US 29, US 78 and etc. at various points.
- Also, funding should come from Tractor Trailer operator companies as well as from State, Federal, and Bond programs. Creative funding needs to be considered.
- Do not like the limited access to the HOV lanes. Definitely need interchanges, but locations need to be studied in detail to assure they are constructed in the proper locations.
- Local governments need to establish the future land-use plans and be held to them along the 316 corridor. This should help with the location studies of the interchanges.
- Tolls might be a hard sell. This could push a lot of traffic to highway 8 and other secondary roads. Toll roads "never" disappear.
- Alternate 2 is preferred.
- Reduce speed. Speed was 55 and changed to 65 and added more lights and didn't reduce speed.
- Add more law enforcement and add a third lane. No tolls, that costs money too. You'll only flood back and side streets.
- Toll road would only penalize the people who live next to 316. \$900,000 for this study could be used as improvements.
- Reduce speed limits to reduce accidents. Less exits, more patrol, speed detector. No tolls, no HOV. Toll road would flood HWY 8 and other roads where school busses and town businesses are.
- There is not enough traffic to justify HOV lanes. If HOV lanes "must" be built, we need the freedom to enter or exit them without barriers. Alternate 1 is more expensive and should not be considered. Add an additional general-purpose lane to each side. There does not need to be a tax increase to fund this project. We pay enough in taxes already to fund this. No gas tax increase no sales tax increase. No toll. Tolls "never" go away. If there is a toll there "must" be an expiration date that is after a certain number of years or keep a running total of what is paid so we know when it is paid off. How much does Alternate 1 cost? How much is Alternate 2? No one had the answer to this. When will this be implemented? How long will it take? No one had the answers to these either.
- So, No Toll, NO Barriers, NO HOV at this time, No tax increases. And when did we pay \$900,000 for this study when that money could have been used to fix the problem instead of talking about it.
- I find it offensive that someone who received \$900,000 in taxpayer funds would tell me that they are going to recommend that my tax burden should increase.
- There is no need for tolls. I do not care if it takes 20 or more years to do upgrades without tolls and sales tax increases.
- There are plenty of programs that the State and Federal Governments fund that are merely "pork" projects and since 28% of my income never makes it into my bank account as it is, you guys have plenty of money and can balance it out without confiscating more of my income.
- Alternate 1 with barrier separated HOV lanes is the only practical design for an HOV facility. Adjacent HOV lanes have been proven inefficient because drivers in HOV lanes must drive more cautiously if there is the possibility of another vehicle entering the lane. Frequent entrance and exit points would be necessary as well as frequent HOV interchanges to accommodate the barrier separated lanes.
- An additional alternate should be considered that allows for 6 SOV plus 2 HOV lanes between I-85 and SR 20.

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Written Comments

- The Kilcrease Road exit is so very busy, how can you consider making it only a grade separation? Also, no one will even begin to explain what will be done with the wetlands at Kilcrease? Even though it has been so dry, it's still wet on both sides of the road. And the west side is drainage for several hills. I'm only 1,000 feet from 316 and the road in front of my place goes up for nearly a mile. It all has to be drained – where? Eventually we will get rain. I don't want a lake in my front yard if you dam up the wetlands. No HOV lanes please, especially the barriers.
 - After attending the meeting in Oconee County concerning HWY 316 I found that it dealt with the problem of getting more cars into the system without any consideration for the current problems. There must be a solution for the merge at 316 and I-85, as I-85 cannot handle the problem now. Do not add more cars to the system without some solution for the current problems.
 - I work in the Lenox Building in Buckhead. I spend one to one and a half hours each morning commuting to work, although at least a good 30 minutes of my commute is on the 8-mile stretch of 316 from Hwy 20 to I-85. I was asked to e-mail you with information about my commute, as I will not be able to attend the meeting tonight. It's gotten to where every morning my stomach turns as I listen to traffic report after traffic report, always mentioning problems on I-85 and the back up on 316. I don't know what to suggest to make things better, but I do know that a toll won't solve the problem. I feel a toll would make things worse as far as holding up moving traffic. Overpasses actually make more sense to me as far as keeping traffic moving. Or, going to four lanes instead of two, although that may only encourage more traffic and only contribute to the volume. Sitting in completely stopped traffic on a major interstate defies logic and reason. Why automobiles aren't moving completely baffles the mind, not to mention what the fumes from those automobiles are doing to the air quality (and to the lungs of the drivers). Something has to give...I am in favor of that. I just don't know what. Well, those are my feelings on the matter, for what it's worth.
 - All the congestion on Hwy 316 is caused by having to stop at traffic lights. Toll collection would make 316 come to a standstill. My home is located 1 mile north of Hwy 316 just north of Hi Hope Road. Every weekday morning at 8:00 am I enter the bumper-to-bumper traffic on Hwy 20 from Hwy 124. It takes from 3 to 6 minutes to reach Hwy 316 from Hwy 124 (less than 1 mile). The delays are caused by trucks that are not capable of accelerating quickly after the frequent stops. Entering Hwy 316 westbound from Hi Hope Road is not an alternative because I have sat through a minimum of three light cycles on 316 to cross Hwy 20. At least 3 of 5 weekdays, Hwy 316 westbound traffic is backed up to Hwy 20 from Collins Hill, waiting to pass the Collins Hill traffic light. Then it's a smooth ride to Sugarloaf PKWY, where I exit, continue to Old Norcross Road and onto work new Gwinnett Place Mall. At 5:15 pm every day, I come to a stop on 316 east at Hwy 120, and then creep to Collins Hill, then creep again to finally turn left onto Hwy 20. Rail, HOV lanes, buses would be useless to me. As I am a Chicago native, I have seen that toll roads create more traffic backups than were there originally, and the toll collection is never removed. I patronize the businesses new Hwy 20, Collins Hill, and Hwy 120 frequently. If Hwy 316 were toll, Hurricane Shoals Road would be at a standstill for all of us trying to reach those businesses. And when the university is finished it will be 10 times worse. I believe the only solution for the Hwy 20 and Collins Hill section of Hwy 316 is to build overpasses.
 - Just this morning I found the SR 316 Corridor Study website via the GDOT website. I did not know this website existed until today, or I would have contacted you sooner. It appears as though there was a public comment meeting yesterday, November 13, in Watkinville, which I would have attended had I known about it. You are listed as a contact person for public comment; therefore, I am sending my comments to you. I travel SR 316 five days a week, Monday through Friday, from my home in Athens to my place of employment in Chamblee (off interstate 85 and Chamblee Tucker Road). I choose to live in Athens because of the high quality of life, but my biggest daily stress is traveling on SR 316. I constantly worry about my safety especially at all of the intersections, both with and without traffic lights. Based on the summary of the Accident analysis, my worries are well founded. As the summary states, "The arterial portions of SR 316 had significantly higher accident rates, both injury and fatality accidents than similar facilities throughout the state." At least three times a week I must quickly move around a car that has turned onto SR 316, either in the right or left lane, to avoid an accident. Further, the Christian crosses that dot length of SR 316, especially at intersections, are a constant reminder of the danger of traveling the highway. Since none of the proposed alternatives to improving SR 316 are posted on the website, I cannot comment on specific alternatives. I have heard some alternatives presented on the news and my comments incorporate some of what I have heard. I do encourage the GDOT to make SR 316 an interstate, which would eliminate current methods of crossing and accessing SR 316. New methods for accessing SR 316 would include formal on and off ramps, such as those found on interstate 85, a bridge overpasses to cross SR 316 if that meant making these types of safety improvements. However, I believe just about anything GDOT does to limit access to and crossing of SR 316 would greatly improve the safety of all travelers. Thank you for the chance to comment.
 - I attended the public hearing on SR 316 at Oconee Middle School on November 13 and would like to submit these comments regarding the proposed project.
 - Time is of the essence. DOT must do everything it can to speed this project up, including innovative funding mechanisms and fast tracking the construction process. Lives are at stake, many of them UGA faculty/staff and students, and untold wasted hours, many of them being paid by UGA to state employees on business. Construction cannot begin too soon. It is needed yesterday. This road should have been an interstate highway from the start and was built on the cheap. We are paying for that now.
 - There seemed to be some presumption on the part of some of the presenters that most of the traffic was bound from Athens to Atlanta in the mornings and returning in the evenings. I think you will find a much larger percentage than you suspect will be east bound in the mornings and west bound in the evenings, those being UGS faculty, staff and students bound for campus. 11% of the UGA faculty and staff live in Oconee County and 48% of UGA students live in core counties of metropolitan Atlanta. 20% of UGA freshmen live in Cobb and Gwinnett Counties. A number of the fatalities and serious injuries on SR 316 have been UGA students en route to and from campus.
 - The alternative calling for barrier-separated HOV lanes and dedicated HOV interchanges id overkill, in my opinion. There is no such system now in place anywhere in Georgia. I would much prefer adding two lanes in each direction – one and HOV lane and the other an additional standard lane, giving three standard lanes and one HOV lane going in each direction. Certainly this could be done within the budget otherwise required to build barriers and dedicated interchanges for HOV. It is my opinion that not only would the alternate 1 design for separated HOV lanes be expensive to build, it would be a confusing and inconvenient design for drivers who would not know where and how to access the system vs. the standard lanes. Such a design would undoubtedly slow construction and completion, as well, and again, time is of the essence. The alternative 2 design is better in that it adds an HOV lane, but it adds only one lane. I would propose an alternate 3 adding two lanes; one HOV and one a standard lane in each direction.
 - Construction should begin immediately to grade separate the most problematic intersections. As someone who drives the full length of this route in three or four round trips many weeks, experience tells me those are, in order of concern, at SR 20 in Lawrenceville, Collins Hill Road in Lawrenceville, and the remaining intersections from US 29 at Dacula and west. Growing rapidly in concern are SR 316 at SR 10 loop in Oconee County, and SR 316 at the Oconee Connector, followed by SR 81 and SR 11 in Barrow County, then Jimmie Daniel Road in Oconee County. The other intersections are still worrisome, but of less immediate priority for grade separation. When the project is staged, I would suggest that construction should begin from each end and meet in the middle.
- There are further concerns beyond each end of this project, which I would hope DOT would address soon, those being the poorly designed interchanges at SR 316 at I-85 in Gwinnett County and the Epps Bridge Parkway (which is the 316 extension) at Atlanta Highway in Clarke County. West/southbound traffic at SR 316 and I-85 needs to be able to flyover and merge from the right (slow), not the left (fast) lanes of I-85 south. North/eastbound traffic at Atlanta Highway in Athens needs a way to go westbound on Atlanta Highway rather than being forced to go east and then make a U-turn at Old Epps Bridge Road. This is very confusing to inbound traffic. Also, the Epps Bridge Parkway thru lanes should remain thru lanes on Atlanta Highway, rather than the current configuration, which rapidly turns the right lane into a right-turn-only lane (dangerous and confusing).

State Route 316 Corridor Study

Written Comments

- The City of Statham needs two access roads coming off SR 316 at Hwy 211 and near Barber Creek Road. The City of Statham needs a road that runs parallel to SR 316 coming from Hwy 211 to Barber Creek Road.
- Barrow County supports the upgrade of SR 316 to limited access freeway standards, including local access along a system of frontage roads. Barrow County has invested a substantial amount of money into developing plans that deal with a limited access upgrade, and has put together specific ideas for interchange and frontage road locations that take into account our local land use patterns, proposed developments and current and future traffic patterns. We would like to see our plans and ideas merged with the Department's plans and ideas to produce the best possible solutions.
- I am a local property owner, citizen and business owner. I urge DOT to act in all dispatch to demonstrate your intent to make SR 316 a safe and efficient freeway system. I also ask you to incorporate the technological component for data and and communication as well as providing for the aesthetic quality of a world class parkway. The need to begin the process to make the 316 route a safe and efficient parkway is now. This project should be high priority.
- I want to express my concern about the lack of safety along SR 316. I believe there is a critical need to upgrade this road to be a limited access freeway.
- I am a resident of Bethlehem in Barrow County. SR 316 needs to be limited access. So many accidents and deaths occur because that what happens when you put turning lanes and red lights on what is basically an interstate. However, I disagree with the plan to make 316 a per mile toll road. I could understand a system similar to 400 but for many commuters their drive consists of the whole distance between Atlanta and Athens. Not only working commuters go to Atlanta but students to Tech, GA State and Georgia. The DOT will face great opposition to the proposed per mile toll. I commend the DOT for recognizing the problem with 316 but lets fix it without robbing the people who need it the most.
- Any set of options GDOT is considering for improving the road must put safety foremost. If budgetary shortfalls mean postponement of the ultimate goal of eliminating all at-grade intersections, then GDOT should concentrate immediately on making the existing road safer. The safest option is reduced speed limits. No amount of HOV lane, electronic signage, or public relations can substitute for driving at slower speeds. If state and local governments can not or will not vigorously enforce lower limits, then GDOT should install any and all legal devices, including traffic signals at all intersections to slow down traffic.
- go to Atlanta but students to Tech, GA State and Georgia. The DOT will face great opposition to the proposed per mile toll. I commend the DOT for recognizing the problem with 316 but lets fix it without robbing the people who need it the most.
- Any set of options GDOT is considering for improving the road must put safety foremost. If budgetary shortfalls mean postponement of the ultimate goal of eliminating all at-grade intersections, then GDOT should concentrate immediately on making the existing road safer. The safest option is reduced speed limits. No amount of HOV lane, electronic signage, or public relations can substitute for driving at slower speeds. If state and local governments can not or will not vigorously enforce lower limits, then GDOT should install any and all legal devices, including traffic signals at all intersections to slow down traffic.